



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,510	12/26/2000	Fredrick L. Pitroff	19571.000	4105
28286	7590	05/20/2005	EXAMINER	
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP Attn: PATENT DOCKETING 2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER 90 SOUTH 7TH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901			ALPERT, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/748,510</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>PITTROFF, FREDRICK L.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>James Alpert</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>3624</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/26/2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/4/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

EA

Jul

DETAILED ACTION

The application has been examined, and Claims 1-15 are pending. Objections and rejections are as stated below.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: System and Methods for an Enterprise Based Issuance of Financial Cards (suggested changes are underlined). In addition, the specification should be amended so that the word "identification", as an adjective for the cards produced by the proposed system and method, is replaced with the word "financial."

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because the Examiner believes that in the first limitation, the phrase "requests are selectively entered into said card issuance *production* queue" should read, "requests are selectively entered into said card issuance component queue". This would be the only interpretation that would not be subject to confusion as to the difference between a component queue and a production queue (and thereby subject to a 35 U.S.C 112 objection). Appropriate correction is required to what appears is a minor informality.

Art Unit: 3624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaros et al., U.S Patent #6877656. Claims 2-3,12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Warwick et al., U.S. Patent #5266781. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Chari et al., U.S. Patent #6134614. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Chari, and in further view of Warwick.

With regard to Claim 1, Jaros teaches the system comprising:

a plurality of card issuance components for production of identification cards;
(Figure 1, items 110,112,120,122,124,130, labeled "remote dispenser";
Col. 7 lines 20-40)

a card issuance controller coupled to said plurality of card issuance components for controlling said plurality of card issuance components to service requests for said production of identification cards;
(Col. 7 lines 20-40)

a server coupled to said card issuance controller through a network for managing requests for production of said identification cards; and
(Col. 4 line 46 – Col. 5 line1; Figure 2)

a card issuance client in communication with said enterprise server through the network for generating requests for said production of identification cards.
(Col. 7 lines 20-40)

Art Unit: 3624

Jaros fails to expressly disclose an intranet over a single organization, that is, it does not specify an "enterprise" system. However, an intranet is old and well-known technology, and a simple modification to card dispensing system of Jaros. It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to modify Jaros to include intranet capability. Such a modification is motivated by a need for increase security, as noted in Jaros at (Col. 4 lines 1-9), which would be provided by an intranet as opposed to a public internet.

With regard to Claim 2, Jaros does not specifically disclose:

a queue corresponding to each of said plurality of card issuance components wherein each request of said requests is entered into a queue corresponding to a selected component of said plurality of card issuance components.

Although the remote dispenser that is described in Jaros implicitly operates with some sort of queuing system in the processor or in its memory for multiple uses, it is not explicitly stated. However, the modular card processing system described in Warwick does teach this limitation at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a system for issuing cards, with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

Art Unit: 3624

With regard to Claim 3, Jaros does not specifically disclose:

a production queue corresponding to a component of said plurality of card issuance components wherein each request of said requests directed to said component is entered into said production queue.

However, the modular card processing system described in Warwick does teach this limitation at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13). It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a system of issuing cards, with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

With regard to Claim 4, Jaros does not specifically disclose:

an administrative client coupled to said enterprise server through the enterprise network for providing a user interface for managing requests for said production of identification cards.

However, Chari does disclose this limitation at (Col. 6 lines 16-27; Col. 8 lines 15-18), which described a GUI used for a client/server system that adds client hardware. It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros relating to a system of issuing cards with the teachings of Chari, relating to a GUI controlled client/server relationship. The motivations for such a combination is because implementing a process using a GUI allows for easy and efficient management and maintenance of peripheral devices in a computer network.

With regard to Claim 5, the interface of Chari further comprises:

iconic representations corresponding to each of said plurality of card issuance components. (Col. 10 lines 56-65)

It would have been obvious to modify Jaros to include this limitation for the same reasons as described in Claim 4.

With regard to Claim 6, a Jaros-Chari combination does not explicitly disclose:

a card issuance component queue corresponding to each of said plurality of card issuance components wherein production requests are selectively entered into said card issuance queue corresponding to a selected component of said plurality of card issuance components;

However, the modular card processing system described in Warwick does teach this limitation at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13). It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of a Jaros-Chari combination, relating to a system of issuing cards, with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests in a card issuance queue. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

With regard to the following limitation:

a production queue corresponding to each component of said plurality of card issuance components wherein production requests are selectively entered into said production queue corresponding to a selected component of said plurality of card issuance components, wherein said graphical user interface further includes iconic representations of each said card issuance production queue and of each said production queue,

Chari teaches a GUI which implements the client/server operation to control the component issuance and production queues, where Jaros fails to do so. See (Col. 6 lines 16-27; Col. 8 lines 15-18). It would have been obvious to modify a Jaros to further include a GUI process for controlling the queuing of card issuance orders. The motivation for such a combination is that implementing a process using a GUI allows for easy and efficient management and maintenance of peripheral devices in a computer network.

With regard to Claim 7, a Jaros-Chari combination does not expressly teach:

a graphical user interface that is operable to permit an administrative user to route future card production requests to a desired alternate card issuance component queue corresponding to another card issuance component of said plurality of card issuance components or to an alternate production queue corresponding to another card issuance component of said plurality of card issuance components.

A Jaros-Chari combination does not disclose alternative queues as described above, but Warwick teaches this at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13). This is an obvious modification to a Jaros-Chari combination, as described in Claim 6. Chari teaches a GUI which to represent a client administrative user to route future card production requests at (Col. 6 lines 16-27; Col. 8 lines 15-18). This is an obvious modification to Jaros as described in the second limitation of Claim 6.

With regard to Claim 8, Jaros teaches a system further comprising:

a database associated with said administrative client for centrally storing identification information and related information associated with said request. (Col. 5 lines 24-42, which described memory and storage associated at the remote locations)

Art Unit: 3624

With regard to Claim 9, Jaros teaches a system further comprising:

a card format database having information regarding types of cards to be produced within the system. (Col. 5 line 13-23; (Col. 7 lines 9-19, secured card)

With regard to Claim 10, Jaros does not teach

a plurality of queues each of which corresponds to one of said plurality of card issuance components wherein each request of said requests is entered into a selected queue of said plurality of queues corresponding to a selected component of said plurality of card issuance components; and

However, the modular card processing system described in Warwick does teach this limitation at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13). It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a system of issuing cards, with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests in a card issuance queue. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

Although Jaros does expressly teach the system further comprising:

links associating each of said requests with said queue based on the type of card identified in each said request,

this claim is inherent to any queuing system in that the queue is "linked" somehow to items entering into the queue. Jaros does teach a "type of card distinction" at (Col. 7 lines 9-19, making the secured card distinction).

With regard to Claim 11, Jaros teaches a method comprising:

generating a request in a client process to produce an identification card wherein said request includes information regarding a type of card to be produced; (Col. 9 lines 25-29; Col. 6 line 58 – Col. 7 line 4)

Art Unit: 3624

transmitting said request from said client process to a server process through a network to manage the production of said identification card; (Col. 9 lines 30-32)

and forwarding said request from said enterprise server process to a card issuance controller process coupled to a plurality of card issuance components for production of said identification card, wherein said type of card determines a selected card issuance component of said plurality of card issuance components for production of said identification card by said card issuance controller process. (Col. 9 lines 40-41; Col. 6 line 58 – Col. 7 line 19)

Jaros fails to expressly disclose an intranet over a single organization, that is, it does not specify an “enterprise” system. However, an intranet is old and well-known technology, and a simple modification to card dispensing system of Jaros. It would have been obvious at the time applicant’s invention was made to modify Jaros to include intranet capability. Such a modification is motivated by a need for increase security, as noted in Jaros at (Col. 4 lines 1-9), which would be provided by an intranet as opposed to a public internet.

With regard to Claim 12, Jaros does not specifically teach:

queueing said request in a card issuance component queue associated with said selected card issuance component.

Although the remote dispenser that is described in Jaros implicitly operates with some sort of queuing system in the processor or in its memory for multiple uses, it is not explicitly stated. However, the modular card processing system described in Warwick does teach this limitation at (Col. 24 line 62 – Col. 25 line 13). It would have been obvious at the time applicant’s invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a method for producing cards, with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple

Art Unit: 3624

requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

With regard to Claim 13, although Jaros does not expressly teach the system further comprising:

links associating each of said requests with said queue based on the type of card identified in each said request,

this claim is inherent to any queuing system in that the queue is "linked" somehow to items entering into the queue. Jaros does teach a "type of card distinction" at (Col. 7 lines 9-19, making the secured card distinction).

With regard to Claim 14, Jaros does not expressly teach the method of this claim, however the details are taught by Warwick and further comprise:

first queuing said request in a production queue associated with said card issuance component; (Col. 24 lines 62-65)

receiving instruction from an administrative user to process requests in said production queue; and (Col. 25 line 5)

transferring said request from said production queue to said card issuance component queue. (Col. 24 lines 57-58, describing inter-process communication)

It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a method for producing cards with the teachings of Warwick, relating to queuing of card production requests. The motivation for such a combination is to ensure that multiple requests can be accommodated, particularly if a telesales agent and/or self-service are being used simultaneously.

Art Unit: 3624

With regard to Claim 15, although Jaros does not expressly teach the system further comprising:

linking said request to a particular production queue based on card type information in said request.

this claim is inherent to any queuing system in that the queue is "linked" somehow to items entering into the queue. Jaros does teach a "type of card distinction" at (Col. 7 lines 9-19, making the secured card distinction).

Conclusion

The following prior art, made of record, but not relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a) Walker et al, U.S. Patent #6144948, November 7, 2000, Instant Credit Card Marketing System for Reservations for Future Services.
- b) Masuda, U.S. Patent #5569897, October 29, 1996, Credit Card System and Method of Issuing Credit Card Using Such a System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Alpert whose telephone number is (571) 272-6738. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

Art Unit: 3624

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



James M. Alpert
May 11, 2005



ALAIN L. BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER